

Restoration - Silver Fork Road Barriers (FINAL)

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Version # _____

APP # 700489

A. List of Restoration Activities

This project proposes to protect and halt further OHV destruction to the newly acquired National Forest System land at Girard Bridge along the Silver Fork Road on the Placerville Ranger District, Eldorado National Forest. This land was previously owned by a private corporation and was acquired through a land exchange. In the past, the area around Girard Bridge has sustained heavy OHV use and resource damage resulting in a loss of native vegetation, erosion and stream course sedimentation. This area is adjacent to the Silver Fork of the American River which draws forest recreation visitors to park and camp along the river and has also been used as a staging area for OHV use. This area was identified in the soils and hydrology report of the Silver Saddle Environmental Assessment as detrimentally denuded and compacted due to heavy dispersed recreation and vehicle traffic which is contributing to sediment delivery to the Silver Fork of the American River. The Forest would like to stop further degradation of the area by controlling OHV traffic by installing barriers and restoring the area between the barriers and the river by installing signs, placing straw mulch and preparing the ground for planting of native vegetation. Barrier devices will prevent vehicles from continuing to park along the river. These barrier devices may be in the form of mounds of soil or barrier rocks. Branches, small trees and down logs from the vicinity would be placed to provide obstructions for travel and disguise from easy detection. The restoration would include use of either a Sweco trail dozer or an excavator to break up the compacted layers of soil with ripper teeth, the tines of the excavator bucket, or in some instances with hand tools. Where feasible, the land forms would be restored and stabilized. Ground cover in the form of nearby natural leaf and litter or certified weed free straw would be spread over the bare soil to reduce erosion. The restoration will be monitored for the next few years to determine if the measures are effective for closure and restoration.

B. Describe how the proposed Project relates to OHV Recreation and how OHV Recreation caused the damage:

The loss of vegetation and sediment delivery to the Silver Fork American River are the result of motor vehicles travelling of the Silver Fork road. Without this restoration project, the degradation will continue to contribute sediment to the American River watershed, degrading water quality and fish habitat. Continued degradation of the Girard Bridge Area may result in total closure of all motorized traffic and possibly the closure of all recreation opportunities the area has to offer.

C. Describe the size of the specific Project Area(s) in acres and/or miles

The total amount of area to be restored is approximately 16 acres including a portion of the Riparian Conservation Area along the Silver Fork of the American River.

D. Monitoring and Methodology

The project includes monitoring both for the effectiveness of the restoration and subsequent incursions into the restored areas. The sites will be visited by patrollers on a regular basis throughout the year to assure that the restored areas are not receiving unauthorized OHV use. Photo monitoring points will also be established within the project area to allow for measuring and recording the success of the restoration efforts. These points will be re-photographed at least two times each year for three years, and the results documented in a report. This area is highly visible to the recreation public and has the potential to reflect positively on the agency's efforts to restore and protect scenic rivers.

E. List of Reports

N/A

F. Goals, Objectives and Methodology / Peer Reviews

N/A

G. Plan for Protection of Restored Area

As described under the monitoring section, the site will be visited by patrollers on a regular basis to assure the closure is still effective, that the signs are in place, and the restored area has not received further impacts.

Additional Documentation

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Version # _____

APP # 700489

1. Project-Specific Maps

Attachments:

[Project Location Map](#)

[Site Map](#)

2. Project-Specific Photos

Attachments:

[Before Photos](#)

Project Cost Estimate

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:		Version # _____		APP # _____	
APPLICANT NAME :	USFS - Eldorado National Forest				
PROJECT TITLE :	Restoration - Silver Fork Road Barriers (FINAL)			PROJECT NUMBER (Division use only) :	G09-02-03-R01
PROJECT TYPE :	<input type="checkbox"/> Acquisition <input type="checkbox"/> Development <input type="checkbox"/> Education & Safety <input type="checkbox"/> Ground Operations <input type="checkbox"/> Law Enforcement <input type="checkbox"/> Planning <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Restoration				
PROJECT DESCRIPTION :	<p>This project proposes to protect and halt further OHV destruction to the newly acquired National Forest System land at Girard Bridge along the Silver Fork Road on the Placerville Ranger District, Eldorado National Forest. This land was previously owned by a private corporation and was acquired through a land exchange. In the past, the area around Girard Bridge has sustained heavy OHV use and resource damage resulting in a loss of native vegetation, erosion and stream course sedimentation. This area is adjacent to the Silver Fork of the American River which draws forest recreation visitors to park and camp along the river and has also been used as a staging area for OHV use. This area was identified in the soils and hydrology report of the Silver Saddle Environmental Assessment as detrimentally denuded and compacted due to heavy dispersed recreation and vehicle traffic which is contributing to sediment delivery to the Silver Fork of the American River. The Forest would like to stop further degradation of the area by controlling OHV traffic by installing barriers and restoring the area between the barriers and the river by installing signs, placing straw mulch and preparing the ground for planting of native vegetation. Barrier devices will prevent vehicles from continuing to park along the river. These barrier devices may be in the form of mounds of soil or barrier rocks. Branches, small trees and down logs from the vicinity would be placed to provide obstructions for travel and disguise from easy detection. The restoration would include use of either a Sweco trail dozer or an excavator to break up the compacted layers of soil with ripper teeth, the tines of the excavator bucket, or in some instances with hand tools. Where feasible, the land forms would be restored and stabilized. Ground cover in the form of nearby natural leaf and litter or certified weed free straw would be spread over the bare soil to reduce erosion. The restoration will be monitored for the next few years to determine if the measures are effective for closure and restoration.</p>				

Line	Item	Qty	Rate	UOM	Grant Request	Match	Total
DIRECT EXPENSES							
Program Expenses							
1	Staff						
	Recreation Planner Notes : Match from Silver Saddle KV funds	3.000	300.000	DAY	0.00	900.00	900.00
	Archeologist	2.000	285.000	DAY	0.00	570.00	570.00
	Botanist	2.000	285.000	DAY	0.00	570.00	570.00
	Other-Soil Scientist	2.000	285.000	DAY	0.00	570.00	570.00

Project Cost Estimate for Grants and Cooperative Agreements Program - 2009/2010
Agency: USFS - Eldorado National Forest
Application: Restoration - Silver Fork Road Barriers (FINAL)

3/1/2010

	Line Item	Qty	Rate	UOM	Grant Request	Match	Total
	Other-Restoration Crew	20.000	180.000	DAY	0.00	3,600.00	3,600.00
	Other-FS Forest Protection Officer	12.000	200.000	DAY	0.00	2,400.00	2,400.00
	Other-Contracting Officer's Representati Notes : Prepare and inspect contract	11.000	375.000	DAY	4,125.00	0.00	4,125.00
	Total for Staff				4,125.00	8,610.00	12,735.00
2	Contracts						
	Other-Barrier Rocks Installed Notes : Cost includes cost of transporting barrier rocks to the site and installation. The Match is based on the value of the barrier rocks contributed by Forest Service	725.000	125.000	EA	68,875.00	21,750.00	90,625.00
3	Materials / Supplies						
	Other-mulch	30.000	20.000	EA	600.00	0.00	600.00
	Other-native seed	1.000	600.000	PKG	600.00	0.00	600.00
	Signs	25.000	40.000	EA	1,000.00	0.00	1,000.00
	Other-intrepretive signs	1.000	750.000	EA	750.00	0.00	750.00
	Total for Materials / Supplies				2,950.00	0.00	2,950.00
4	Equipment Use Expenses						
	Other-SWECO	2.000	500.000	DAY	1,000.00	0.00	1,000.00
	Other-Vehicle Mileage	550.000	0.500	MI	0.00	275.00	275.00
	Total for Equipment Use Expenses				1,000.00	275.00	1,275.00
5	Equipment Purchases						
6	Others						
7	Indirect Costs						
	Indirect Costs-billing and record	1.000	4000.000	EA	0.00	4,000.00	4,000.00

Project Cost Estimate for Grants and Cooperative Agreements Program - 2009/2010
Agency: USFS - Eldorado National Forest
Application: Restoration - Silver Fork Road Barriers (FINAL)

3/1/2010

	Line Item	Qty	Rate	UOM	Grant Request	Match	Total
Total Program Expenses					76,950.00	34,635.00	111,585.00
TOTAL DIRECT EXPENSES					76,950.00	34,635.00	111,585.00
TOTAL EXPENDITURES					76,950.00	34,635.00	111,585.00

Project Cost Summary for Grants and Cooperative Agreements Program - 2009/2010
Agency: USFS - Eldorado National Forest
Application: Restoration - Silver Fork Road Barriers (FINAL)

3/1/2010

	Line Item	Grant Request	Match	Total	Narrative
DIRECT EXPENSES					
Program Expenses					
1	Staff	4,125.00	8,610.00	12,735.00	
2	Contracts	68,875.00	21,750.00	90,625.00	
3	Materials / Supplies	2,950.00	0.00	2,950.00	
4	Equipment Use Expenses	1,000.00	275.00	1,275.00	
5	Equipment Purchases	0.00	0.00	0.00	
6	Others	0.00	0.00	0.00	
7	Indirect Costs	0.00	4,000.00	4,000.00	
Total Program Expenses		76,950.00	34,635.00	111,585.00	
TOTAL DIRECT EXPENSES		76,950.00	34,635.00	111,585.00	
TOTAL EXPENDITURES		76,950.00	34,635.00	111,585.00	

Environmental Review Data Sheet (ERDS)

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Version # _____

APP # 700489

ITEM 1 and ITEM 2

ITEM 1

- a. ITEM 1 - Has a CEQA Notice of Determination (NOD) been filed for the Project? ☐ Yes ☒ No
(Please select Yes or No)

ITEM 2

- b. Does the proposed Project include a request for funding for CEQA and/or NEPA document preparation prior to implementing the remaining Project Deliverables (i.e., is it a two-phased Project pursuant to Section 4970.06.1(b)) (Please select Yes or No) ☐ Yes ☒ No

ITEM 3 - Project under CEQA Guidelines Section 15378

- c. ITEM 3 - Are the proposed activities a "Project" under CEQA Guidelines Section 15378? ☒ Yes ☐ No
(Please select Yes or No)
- d. The Application is requesting funds solely for personnel and support to enforce OHV laws and ensure public safety. These activities would not cause any physical impacts on the environment and are thus not a "Project" under CEQA. (Please select Yes or No) ☐ Yes ☒ No
- e. Other. Explain why proposed activities would not cause any physical impacts on the environment and are thus not a "Project" under CEQA. DO NOT complete ITEMS 4 – 10

ITEM 4 - Impact of this Project on Wetlands

This project is not expected to adversely affect wetlands, streams, creeks, or any threatened, endangered, or other special status species, based on the environmental analyses completed (2009 Decision Notice). The project does not involve any streams, creeks or wetlands and is designed to improve water quality through reducing surface erosion. The restoration project is also designed to reduce sediment delivery to the Silver Fork of the American River from unauthorized motor vehicle use in the impacted area.

ITEM 5 - Cumulative Impacts of this Project

No cumulative impacts are expected from implementation of this project. The area that is being restored is not an area that is open to OHV travel, and so will not change overall use patterns or displace users. This project is designed to reduce the potential for cumulative watershed impacts.

ITEM 6 - Soil Impacts

This project will not have adverse effects on steep slopes or highly erodible soils. The restoration efforts will include controlling vehicle travel onto the disturbed area, thus limiting further erosion. Areas of compacted soil will be ripped and mulched.

ITEM 7 - Damage to Scenic Resources

This project area does not include any State Scenic Highways nor is it visible from a State Scenic Highway.

ITEM 8 - Hazardous Materials

- Is the proposed Project Area located on a site included on any list compiled pursuant to Section 65962.5 of the California Government Code (hazardous materials)? (Please select Yes or No) ☐ Yes ☒ No

If YES, describe the location of the hazard relative to the Project site, the level of hazard and the measures to be taken to minimize or avoid the hazards.

ITEM 9 - Potential for Adverse Impacts to Historical or Cultural Resources

Would the proposed Project have potential for any substantial adverse impacts to historical or cultural resources? (Please select Yes or No) ☐ Yes ☒ No

Discuss the potential for the proposed Project to have any substantial adverse impacts to historical or cultural resources.

Based on the analysis completed as a part of the Silver Saddle Forest Health project, which includes this restoration work, it was determined that the project will not cause loss or destruction of significant cultural or historical resources. The project area was surveyed for historical and cultural sites and protection measures have been incorporated into the project (2009 Silver Saddle DN).

ITEM 10 - Indirect Significant Impacts

The project is not likely to cause indirect significant impacts. As described previously, the area that is being restored is not open to motor vehicle use and so will not change overall use patterns in the area or in other parts of the Eldorado National Forest.

CEQA/NEPA Attachment

Attachments:

[2009 Silver Saddle Decision Notice](#)
[2009 Silver Saddle EA excerpts](#)

Evaluation Criteria

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Version # _____

APP # 700489

1. Project Cost Estimate - Q 1. (Auto populates from Cost Estimate)

1. As calculated on the Project Cost Estimate, the percentage of the Project costs covered by the Applicant is: 3

(Note: This field will auto-populate once the Cost Estimate and Evaluation Criteria are Validated.) (Please select one from list)

- ☐ 76% or more (10 points)
☐ 51% - 75% (5 points)
☒ 26% - 50% (3 points)
☐ 25% (Match minimum) (No points)

2. Natural and Cultural Resources - Q 2.

2. Natural and Cultural Resources - Failure to fund the Project will result in adverse impacts to: 7

(Check all that apply) (Please select applicable values)

- ☐ Domestic water supply (4 points)
☐ Archeological and historical resources identified in the California Register of Historical Resources or the Federal Register of Historic Places (3 points)
☒ Stream or other watercourse (3 points)
☒ Soils - Site actively eroding (2 points)
☒ Sensitive areas (e.g., wilderness, riparian, wetlands, ACEC) (2 point each, up to a maximum of 6) Enter number of sensitive habitats [1]
☐ Threatened and Endangered (T&E) listed species (2 point each, up to a maximum of 6) Enter number of T&E species
☐ Other special-status species- Number of special-status species (1 point each, up to a maximum of 3) Enter number of special-status species

Describe the type and severity of impacts that might occur relative to the checked item(s):

The Silver Fork- Girard Area is currently degrading due to soil compaction, sediment and run-off and loss of native vegetation. Without restoration projects like these public recreation areas would suffer further visual and physical degradation to water quality, fish and wildlife habitat and riparian dependant vegetation and likely be closed to the public.

3. Reason for Project - Q 3.

3. Reason for the Project 4

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☐ Protect special-status species or cultural site (4 points)
☒ Restore natural resource system damaged by OHV activity (4 points)
☐ OHV activity in a closed area (3 points)
☐ Alternative measures attempted, but failed (2 points)
☐ Management decision (1 point)
☐ Scientific and cultural studies (1 point)
☐ Planning efforts associated with Restoration (1 point)

Reference Document

Eldorado National Forest Travel Management Environmental Impact Statement
Eldorado National Forest Land Management Plan Management Area 20
Silver Saddle Forest Health Project Environmental Analysis

4. Measures to Ensure Success - Q 4.

4. Measures to ensure success –The Project makes use of the following elements to ensure successful implementation 10

(Check all that apply) Scoring: 2 points each (Please select applicable values)

- ☒ Site monitoring to prevent additional damage
- ☒ Construction of barriers and other traffic control devices
- ☒ Use of native plants and materials
- ☒ Incorporation of universally recognized 'Best Management Practices'
- ☒ Educational signage
- ☐ Identification of alternate OHV routes to ensure that OHV activities will not reoccur in restored area

Explain each item checked above:

The project will stop further degradation of the area by controlling OHV traffic by installing barriers and signs, and restoring the area between the barriers and the river by placing straw mulch and preparing the ground for planting of native vegetation. Barrier devices will prevent vehicles from continuing to park along the river. These barrier devices may be in the form of mounds of soil or barrier rocks, along with branches, small trees and down logs to provide obstructions for travel and disguise from easy detection. The restoration would include breaking up the compacted layers of soil with ripper teeth, the tines of an excavator bucket, or in some instances with hand tools. Where feasible, the land forms would be restored and stabilized. Ground cover (nearby natural leaf and litter or certified weed free straw) would be spread over the bare soil to reduce erosion. The restoration will be monitored for the next few years to determine if the measures are effective for closure and restoration.

5. Publicly Reviewed Plan - Q 5.

5. Is there a publicly reviewed and adopted plan (e.g., wilderness designation, land management plans, route designation decisions) that supports the need for the Restoration Project? 5

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☐ No (No points) ☒ Yes (5 points)

Identify plan

The Eldorado National Forest Land Management Plan
The Silver Saddle Forest Health Project
The Eldorado National Forest Travel Management Plan

6. Primary Funding Source - Q 6.

6. Primary funding source for future operational costs associated with the Project will be: 0

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☐ Applicant's operational budget (5 points)
- ☐ Volunteer support and/or donations (3 points)
- ☐ Other Grant funding (2 points)
- ☒ OHV Trust Funds (No points)

If 'Operational budget' is checked, list reference document(s):

7. Public Input - Q 7.

7. The Project was developed with public input employing the following 1

(Check all that apply) Scoring: 1 point each, up to a maximum of 2 points (Please select applicable values)

- ☒ Publicly noticed meeting(s) with the general public to discuss Project (1 point)
☐ Conference call(s) with interested parties (1 point)
☐ Meeting(s) with stakeholders (1 point)

Explain each statement that was checked

Public scoping provided the written project description to interested parties. Numerous public meetings and conference calls were conducting during the Eldorado National Forest Travel Management Environmental Impact Statement. Discussion with California Native Plant Society local chapter and California Wilderness Coalition regarding this project.

8. Utilization of Partnerships - Q 8.

8. The Project will utilize partnerships to successfully accomplish the Project. The number of partner organizations that will participate in the Project are 2

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☐ 4 or more (4 points) ☒ 2 to 3 (2 points)
☐ 1 (1 point) ☐ None (No points)

List partner organization(s):

Trout Unlimited, California Wilderness Coalition

9. Scientific and Cultural Studies - Q 9.

9. Scientific and cultural studies will

(Check all that apply) (Please select applicable values)

- ☐ Determine appropriate Restoration techniques (2 points)
☐ Examine potential effects of OHV Recreation on natural or cultural resources (2 points)
☐ Examine methods to ensure success of Restoration efforts (1 point)
☐ Lead to direct management action (1 point)

Explain each item checked above

10. Underlying Problem - Q 10.

10. The underlying problem that resulted in the need for the Restoration Project has been effectively addressed and resolved 3

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☐ No (No points) ☒ Yes (3 points)

Explain 'Yes' answer

The land has been acquired through a land exchange and OHV use went un-checked prior to the Forest Service acquisition. If funded we intend to prevent further degradation and restore the area to natural conditions.

11. Size of sensitive habitats - Q 11.

11. Size of sensitive habitats (e.g., wilderness, riparian, wetlands, ACEC) within the Project Area which will be restored 5

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☒ Greater than 10 acres (5 points)

- ☐ 1 – 10 acres (3 points)
- ☐ Less than 1 acre (1 points)
- ☐ No sensitive habitat within Project Area (No points)